UT-785

arXiv:hep-th/9708007v2 19 Jan 1998

BRST gauge fixing and the algebra of global supersymmetry

Kazuo Fujikawa and Kazumi Okuyama

Department of Physics,University of Tokyo
Bunkyo-ku,Tokyo 113,Japan

fujikawa@hep-th.phys.s.u-tokyo.ac.jp , okuyama@hep-th.phys.s.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Abstract

A global supersymmetry (SUSY) in supersymmetric gauge theory is generally broken by gauge fixing. A prescription to extract physical information from such SUSY algebra broken by gauge fixing is analyzed in path integral framework. If $\delta_{SUSY}\delta_{BRST}\Psi = \delta_{BRST}\delta_{SUSY}\Psi$ for a gauge fixing "fermion" Ψ, the SUSY charge density is written as a sum of the piece which is naively expected without gauge fixing and a BRST exact piece. If $\delta_{SUSY}\delta_{SUSY}\delta_{BRST}\Psi = \delta_{BRST}\delta_{SUSY}\delta_{SUSY}\Psi$, the equal-time anti-commutator of SUSY charge is written as a sum of a physical piece and a BRST exact piece. We illustrate these properties for $N = 1$ and $N = 2$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theories and for a $D = 10$ massive superparticle (or "D-particle") where the κ-symmetry provides extra complications.

1 Introduction

In some of the applications of supersymmetric (SUSY) gauge theory [1], the SUSY algebra, in particular, its possible central extension provides important physical information[2]. On the other hand, the global SUSY in generic supersymmetric gauge theory is generally broken by gauge fixing, at least in the component formulation in the Wess-Zumino gauge. The SUSY charge thus generally becomes *time-dependent* after gauge fixing. In such a situation, it is important to specify how to extract physical information from the *broken* charge algebra. In the present note, we present a general prescription how to extract physical information from the *equal-time* anti-commutator of such broken SUSY charge density in the framework of path integral and the Bjorken-Johnson-Low (BJL) prescription [3]. The quantities in path integral , which are defined in terms of T*-product , are converted into those in the conventional T-product by BJL prescription, which in turn readily provide information about the equal-time (anti-) commutator.

The essence of our analysis is summarized as follows: If one defines the gauge fixing Lagrangian by $\mathcal{L}_g = \delta_{BRST}\Psi$, where Ψ is a gauge fixing "fermionic" function, the SUSY charge density J^0_{SUSY} is written as

$$J^0_{SUSY} = J^0_{SUSY(naive)} + \textit{ BRST exact piece} \tag{1.1}$$

if

$$\delta_{SUSY}\delta_{BRST}\Psi = \delta_{BRST}\delta_{SUSY}\Psi \tag{1.2}$$

where δ_{SUSY} is a localized (coordinate dependent) SUSY transformation, and $J^0_{SUSY(naive)}$ is the naive charge density expected before gauge fixing.

If one has the relation with another SUSY transformation

$$\delta'_{SUSY}\delta_{SUSY}\delta_{BRST}\Psi = \delta_{BRST}\delta'_{SUSY}\delta_{SUSY}\Psi \tag{1.3}$$

one obtains the equal-time anti-commutation relation

$$\{Q_\alpha(x^0), Q_\beta(y^0)\}_{x^0=y^0} = \textit{physical piece} + \textit{BRST exact piece} \tag{1.4}$$

where the physical piece as well as the BRST exact piece are obtained from a SUSY transformation of the SUSY charge density in path integral formulation. These properties hold when one assigns all the unphysical (ghost) particles to be SUSY *scalar*, namely, they are not transformed under SUSY transformation.

An advantage of this path integral formulation is that one can readily identify the possible presence of generic "Schwinger terms" such as the physical central extension. It turns out that the second property in (1.4) holds for a more general class of theories and gauge fixing than the first property in (1.1). The properties (1.1) and (1.2) have been analyzed in the past in Refs.[4] and [5]. To our knowledge, a systematic analysis of (1.3) and (1.4) has not been performed before.

In the following, we illustrate these properties for $N = 1$ and $N = 2$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theories and for a $D = 10$ massive superparticle which may be regarded as a "D-particle". In the latter case, the so-called κ- symmetry gives rise to additional technical complications.

2 $N = 1$ super Yang-Mills theory

As a first example, we consider supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory . The Lagrangian is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = -\frac{1}{g^2} 2\mathrm{tr}\left(\frac{1}{4} F_{mn}F^{mn} + i\bar{\lambda}\bar{\sigma}^m D_m \lambda\right) \tag{2.1}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} D_m\lambda &= \partial_m\lambda - i[A_m, \lambda] \\ F_{mn} &= \partial_m A_n - \partial_n A_m - i[A_m, A_n] \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

Here we normalized the generators T^a of gauge symmetry by $\mathrm{tr}T^aT^b = \frac{1}{2}\delta^{ab}$. The Landau-type gauge , for example, is defined by

$$\mathcal{L}_g = 2\mathrm{tr}(B\partial_m A^m - i\bar{c}\partial_m D^m c) = 2\mathrm{tr}\delta_{BRST}(\bar{c}\partial_m A^m) \tag{2.3}$$

The SUSY transformation rules are

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{SUSY}A_m &= i(\bar{\xi}\bar{\sigma}_m\lambda - \bar{\lambda}\bar{\sigma}_m\xi) \\ \delta_{SUSY}\lambda &= \sigma^{mn}\xi F_{mn} \\ \delta_{SUSY}\bar{\lambda} &= -\bar{\xi}\bar{\sigma}^{mn}F_{mn} \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

and the BRST transformation rules are defined by using a Grassmann parameter ϵ as

$$\delta A_m = i\epsilon D_m c = i\epsilon(\partial_m c - i[A_m, c])$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\delta\lambda = -[\epsilon c, \lambda], \quad \delta\bar{\lambda} = -[\epsilon c, \bar{\lambda}] \\
&\delta c = -\frac{1}{2}[\epsilon c, c] \\
&\delta\bar{c} = \epsilon B, \quad \delta B = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

Here c and $\bar{c}$ are the Faddeev-Popov ghost and anti-ghost, and B is the Nakanishi-Lautrup field. We can confirm that δ_{BRST} and δ_{SUSY} commute on A_μ and λ by the above transformation rules

$$\begin{aligned}
&\delta_{BRST}\delta_{SUSY}A_\mu = \delta_{SUSY}\delta_{BRST}A_\mu = -[\epsilon c, \delta_{SUSY}A_\mu] \\
&\delta_{BRST}\delta_{SUSY}\lambda = \delta_{SUSY}\delta_{BRST}\lambda = -[\epsilon c, \delta_{SUSY}\lambda]
\end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

In other words, the gauge fixing fermion $\Psi = \bar{c}\partial_m A^m$ in (2.3) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_{BRST}\delta_{SUSY}\Psi &= \delta_{BRST}\bar{c}\partial_m(\delta_{SUSY}A^m) \\
&= B\partial_m(\delta_{SUSY}A^m) + \bar{c}\partial_m(\delta_{BRST}\delta_{SUSY}A^m) \\
&= B\partial_m(\delta_{SUSY}A^m) + \bar{c}\partial_m(\delta_{SUSY}\delta_{BRST}A^m) \\
&= \delta_{SUSY}(\delta_{BRST}(\bar{c}\partial_m A^m)) \\
&= \delta_{SUSY}\delta_{BRST}\Psi
\end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

and similarly

$$\delta_{BRST}\delta'_{SUSY}\delta_{SUSY}\Psi = \delta'_{SUSY}\delta_{SUSY}\delta_{BRST}\Psi \tag{2.8}$$

even for the localized (coordinate dependent) SUSY transformation. In fact these properties hold for a more general class of gauge fixing fermion $\Psi = \bar{c}F(A_m, \lambda)$. Note that all the un-physical particles are assigned to be SUSY scalar, namely, they are not transformed under SUSY transformation. These properties suggest that the supercurrent and superalgebra have the structure (1.1) and (1.4), which can be confirmed below.

The variation of the total Lagrangian $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{L}_g$ under SUSY transformation with position dependent parameters is

$$\delta_{SUSY}\mathcal{L} = \partial^m\bar{\xi}\bar{S}_m + \bar{\xi}\bar{J} + S_m\partial^m\xi + J\xi \tag{2.9}$$

where the SUSY currents and SUSY violating source terms are given by

$$S_m = -\frac{2i}{g^2}\mathrm{tr}(\bar{\lambda}\bar{\sigma}_m\sigma_{kl}F^{kl}) - 2i\mathrm{tr}\delta_{BRST}(\bar{c}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\sigma}_m) = -\frac{2i}{g^2}\mathrm{tr}(2\bar{\lambda}\bar{\sigma}^n F^+_{nm}) - 2i\mathrm{tr}\delta_{BRST}(\bar{c}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\sigma}_m)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\bar{S}_m = -\frac{2i}{g^2}\mathrm{tr}(F^{kl}\bar{\sigma}_{kl}\bar{\sigma}_m\lambda) - 2i\mathrm{tr}\delta_{BRST}(\bar{c}\bar{\sigma}_m\lambda) = -\frac{2i}{g^2}\mathrm{tr}(2F^-_{mn}\bar{\sigma}^n\lambda) - 2i\mathrm{tr}\delta_{BRST}(\bar{c}\bar{\sigma}_m\lambda) \\
&J = -2i\mathrm{tr}\delta_{BRST}(\bar{c}\partial^m\bar{\lambda}\bar{\sigma}_m) \\
&\bar{J} = 2i\mathrm{tr}\delta_{BRST}(\bar{c}\bar{\sigma}_m\partial^m\lambda)
\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

These SUSY currents S_m and $\bar{S}_m$ have the structure indicated in (1.1). Here we defined

$$F^{\pm}_{mn} = \frac{1}{2}(F_{mn} \pm \hat{F}_{mn}) = \frac{1}{2}\left(F_{mn} \pm i\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{mnkl}F^{kl}\right) \tag{2.11}$$

where $\hat{F} = \hat{*}F = i * F$. In Lorentz metric $\hat{*}^2 F = F$, and $F^{\pm}$ are a self-dual (or anti-self-dual) part of F ,i.e., $\hat{*}F^{\pm} = \pm F^{\pm}$.

A Ward-Takahashi identity for supersymmetry is obtained by starting with

$$\langle S_a(y)\eta\rangle \equiv \int d\mu S_a(y)\eta e^{i\int \mathcal{L}d^4x} \tag{2.12}$$

with a global Grassmann parameter η and performing the change of field variables under the localized SUSY transformation parametrized by $\xi(x)$ and $\bar{\xi}(x)$. By taking the variational derivative with respect to $\xi(x)$ and $\bar{\xi}(x)$, one obtains W-T identities. For notational simplicity, we here write the identities obtained by multiplying *global* ξ and $\bar{\xi}$ anew:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int d^3x\xi[\partial_0\langle \mathrm{T}^* S^0(x)S_a(y)\eta\rangle - \langle \mathrm{T}^* J(x)S_a(y)\eta\rangle] \\
+ &\int d^3x\bar{\xi}[\partial_0\langle \mathrm{T}^* \bar{S}^0(x)S_a(y)\eta\rangle - \langle \mathrm{T}^* \bar{J}(x)S_a(y)\eta\rangle] \\
= &\ \delta(x^0 - y^0)\left\langle 2\bar{\xi}\bar{\sigma}^m\eta\Big(\tilde{T}_{ma}(y) - 2\mathrm{tr}\delta_{BRST}(\bar{c}F^-_{ma})(y)\Big) + \xi M_a(y)\eta\right\rangle \\
&-\frac{\partial}{\partial x^0}\delta(x^0 - y^0)\left\langle 4\mathrm{tr}\Big(\bar{\lambda}\bar{\sigma}_a\sigma^{0l}\eta\delta_{SUSY}A_l\Big)(y)\right\rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

where we defined

$$\xi M_a\eta = (i\xi\sigma_{an}\eta - \frac{3}{2}i\eta_{an}\xi\eta)2\mathrm{tr}[\bar{\lambda}\bar{\sigma}^n\sigma^k D_k\bar{\lambda}] \tag{2.14}$$

and $\tilde{T}_{ma}$ is the energy-momentum tensor for supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{T}_{ma} = T^{YM}_{ma} + T^{\lambda}_{ma} \\
&g^2 T^{YM}_{ma} = 2\mathrm{tr}\left(F_{mk}F_a{}^k - \frac{1}{4}\eta_{ma}F_{kl}F^{kl}\right) \\
&g^2 T^{\lambda}_{ma} = \frac{i}{4}2\mathrm{tr}(\bar{\lambda}\bar{\sigma}_m D_a\lambda + 3\bar{\lambda}\bar{\sigma}_a D_m\lambda) - \frac{1}{4}\eta_{ma}2\mathrm{tr}(i\bar{\lambda}\bar{\sigma}^k D_k\lambda) \\
&\qquad - \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon_{makn}2\mathrm{tr}(\bar{\lambda}\bar{\sigma}^n D^k\lambda)
\end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

We here recall the basic idea of the BJL prescription [3]. The correlation function defined by T*-product

$$\langle \mathrm{T}^* A(x)B(y)\rangle \tag{2.16}$$

can be replaced by the conventional T-product if

$$\lim_{q^0\to\infty}\int d^4x e^{iq(x-y)}\langle \mathrm{T}^* A(x)B(y)\rangle = 0 \tag{2.17}$$

If the above quantity does not vanish, one defines the T-product by

$$\begin{aligned}\int d^4x e^{iq(x-y)}\langle \mathrm{T} A(x)B(y)\rangle &\equiv \int d^4x e^{iq(x-y)}\langle \mathrm{T}^* A(x)B(y)\rangle \\ &- \lim_{q^0\to\infty}\int d^4x e^{iq(x-y)}\langle \mathrm{T}^* A(x)B(y)\rangle \end{aligned}\tag{2.18}$$

In either case we have

$$\lim_{q^0\to\infty}\int d^4x e^{iq(x-y)}\langle \mathrm{T} A(x)B(y)\rangle = 0 \tag{2.19}$$

which defines the T-product in general.

In the present context, the term proportional to $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^0}\delta(x^0-y^0)$ in the right-hand side is subtracted away if one uses the T-product in eq.(2.13). We then obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\int d^3x\xi[\partial_0\langle \mathrm{T}S^0(x)S_a(y)\eta\rangle - \langle \mathrm{T}J(x)S_a(y)\eta\rangle] \\ +\ &\int d^3x\bar{\xi}[\partial_0\langle \mathrm{T}\bar{S}^0(x)S_a(y)\eta\rangle - \langle \mathrm{T}\bar{J}(x)S_a(y)\eta\rangle] \\ =\ &\delta(x^0-y^0)\left\langle 2\bar{\xi}\bar{\sigma}^m\eta\Big(\tilde{T}_{ma}(y) - 2\mathrm{tr}\delta_{BRST}(\bar{c}F^-_{ma})(y)\Big) + \xi M_a(y)\eta\right\rangle\end{aligned}\tag{2.20}$$

If one performs the explicit time derivative operation in the left-hand side and if one uses the current conservation condition following from (2.9)

$$\int d^3x(\partial_0 S^0(x) - J(x)) = \int d^3x(\partial_0\bar{S}^0(x) - \bar{J}(x)) = 0 \tag{2.21}$$

one obtains the following commutation relations

$$\Big[\bar{\xi}\bar{Q}(x^0), S_a(y)\eta\Big]_{x^0=y^0} = 2\bar{\xi}\bar{\sigma}^m\eta\Big(\tilde{T}_{ma} - 2\mathrm{tr}\delta_{BRST}(\bar{c}F^-_{ma})\Big)(y) \tag{2.22}$$

$$\Big[\xi Q(x^0), S_a(y)\eta\Big]_{x^0=y^0} = \xi M_a(y)\eta \tag{2.23}$$

Eq.(2.22) shows that SUSY algebra at equal-time closes up to a BRST exact term. If the right-hand side of Eq.(2.23) does not vanish, it would represent a possible "central extension of N=1 SUSY algebra". Note that nowhere in our calculation the equations of motion have been used. The right-hand side of Eq.(2.23) vanishes if one uses the (safe) equation of motion in Eq.(2.14). We thus recover the conventional SUSY algebra defined in Poincare invariant vacuum , as is described in (1.4). A further comment on the central extension will be given in Section 5.

In passing, we here note several useful relations in our path integral manipulation. To obtain (2.10) and also identify the energy-momentum tensor (2.15), we use the following identities,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar\sigma^l\sigma^m\bar\sigma^n &= -\eta^{lm}\bar\sigma^n - \eta^{mn}\bar\sigma^l + \eta^{ln}\bar\sigma^m - i\varepsilon^{lmnk}\bar\sigma_k \\ F_{kl}\bar\sigma^{kl}\bar\sigma^m &= 2F_-^{mn}\bar\sigma_n \\ \bar\sigma^m\sigma^{kl}F_{kl} &= 2\bar\sigma_n F_+^{nm} \end{aligned} \tag{2.24}$$

For the general 2-form A_{mn} and B_{mn}, we have the identities

$$\begin{aligned} A^+_{mn}B^{-mn} &= 0 \\ A^\pm_{mk}B^{\pm k}_n + B^\pm_{mk}A^{\pm k}_n &= \frac{1}{2}\eta_{mn}A^\pm_{kl}B^{\pm kl} \\ A^+_{mk}B^{-k}_n = B^-_{mk}A^{+k}_n &= A^-_{mk}B^{+k}_n \end{aligned} \tag{2.25}$$

Using these identities, the energy-momentum tensor of gauge field $T^{\rm YM}_{mn}$ in (2.15) is written as

$$T^{\rm YM}_{mn} = \frac{4}{g^2}{\rm tr}F^+_{mk}F^{-k}_n = \frac{4}{g^2}{\rm tr}F^-_{mk}F^{+k}_n \tag{2.26}$$

In the evaluation of (2.14), we used the relation

$$\xi\sigma^{mk}\eta\,{\rm tr}[\bar\lambda\bar\sigma_{ma}D_k\bar\lambda] = \xi\sigma_{ma}\eta\,{\rm tr}[\bar\lambda\bar\sigma^{mk}D_k\bar\lambda] \tag{2.27}$$

3 $N=2$ super Yang-Mills theory

We next analyze the superalgebra of $N=2$ super Yang-Mills theory. The Lagrangian of $N=2$ super Yang-Mills theory is given by Ref.[6].

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_0 &= \frac{2}{g^2}{\rm tr}\Big(-\frac{1}{4}F^{mn}F_{mn} - D_m\phi^\dagger D_m\phi - i\bar\lambda\bar\sigma^m D_m\lambda - i\bar\psi\bar\sigma^m D_m\psi \\ &\quad + i\sqrt{2}(\bar\psi[\bar\lambda,\phi] + [\lambda,\phi^\dagger]\psi) - \frac{1}{2}[\phi,\phi^\dagger]^2\Big) + \frac{\theta}{16\pi^2}{\rm tr}F_{mn}\tilde F^{mn} \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

where $\tilde{F}^{mn} = \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{mnkl}F_{kl}$. This Lagrangian is invariant under $N = 2$ SUSY. The first SUSY transformation $\delta^{(1)}$ is defined by

$$\begin{array}{lcl}
\delta_\xi^{(1)}\phi = \sqrt{2}\xi\psi & , & \delta_\xi^{(1)}\phi^\dagger = 0 \\
\delta_\xi^{(1)}\psi = 0 & , & \delta_\xi^{(1)}\bar{\psi} = -i\sqrt{2}D_m\phi^\dagger\xi\sigma^m \\
\delta_\xi^{(1)}\lambda = (\sigma^{kl}F_{kl} + i[\phi, \phi^\dagger])\xi & , & \delta_\xi^{(1)}\bar{\lambda} = 0 \\
\delta_\xi^{(1)}A_m = -i\bar{\lambda}\bar{\sigma}_m\xi & &
\end{array} \tag{3.2}$$

We write only the SUSY transformation with the parameter ξ; SUSY with the parameter $\bar{\xi}$ is given by its complex conjugation. The variables λ and ψ form an $SU(2)_R$ doublet. The second SUSY transformation $\delta^{(2)}$ is obtained from $\delta^{(1)}$ by the $SU(2)_R$ rotation $(\lambda, \psi) \rightarrow (\psi, -\lambda)$,

$$\begin{array}{lcl}
\delta_\xi^{(2)}\phi = -\sqrt{2}\xi\lambda & , & \delta_\xi^{(2)}\phi^\dagger = 0 \\
\delta_\xi^{(2)}\psi = (\sigma^{kl}F_{kl} + i[\phi, \phi^\dagger])\xi & , & \delta_\xi^{(2)}\bar{\psi} = 0 \\
\delta_\xi^{(2)}\lambda = 0 & , & \delta_\xi^{(2)}\bar{\lambda} = i\sqrt{2}D_m\phi^\dagger\xi\sigma^m \\
\delta_\xi^{(2)}A_m = -i\bar{\lambda}\bar{\sigma}_m\xi & &
\end{array} \tag{3.3}$$

The gauge fixing term for the Landau gauge is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_g = 2\mathrm{tr}(B\partial_m A^m - i\bar{c}\partial_m D^m c) = 2\mathrm{tr}\delta_{BRST}(\bar{c}\partial_m A^m) \tag{3.4}$$

BRST transformation rules are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\delta A_m = i\epsilon D_m c \\
&\delta\lambda = -[\epsilon c, \lambda]\ ,\ \delta\psi = -[\epsilon c, \psi] \\
&\delta\phi = -[\epsilon c, \phi] \\
&\delta c = -\frac{1}{2}[\epsilon c, c] \\
&\delta\bar{c} = \epsilon B\ ,\ \delta B = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

We can confirm that δ_{BRST} and δ_{SUSY} thus defined commute on ϕ, ψ, λ andA_m. See (2.6). We thus conclude that the general analyses (1.1) - (1.4) apply to the present case, as is explicitly demonstrated below.

The variation of the total Lagrangian $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{L}_g$ under SUSY transformation with position dependent parameters ξ $(A = 1, 2)$ is

$$\delta_\xi^{(A)}\mathcal{L} = S_m^{(A)}\partial^m\xi + J^{(A)}\xi \tag{3.6}$$

where the supercurrents and SUSY violating densities are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
S_m^{(1)}\eta &= \frac{2i}{g^2}\mathrm{tr}\left[-\bar{\lambda}\bar{\sigma}_m(\sigma^{kl}F_{kl}+i[\phi,\phi^\dagger])\eta - i\sqrt{2}D_k\phi^\dagger\eta\sigma^k\bar{\sigma}_m\psi\right] - 2i\mathrm{tr}\delta_{BRST}(\bar{c}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\sigma}_m\eta) \\
&= \frac{2i}{g^2}\mathrm{tr}\delta_\eta^{(1)}(-\bar{\lambda}\bar{\sigma}_m\lambda+\bar{\psi}\bar{\sigma}_m\psi) - 2i\mathrm{tr}\delta_{BRST}(\bar{c}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\sigma}_m\eta) \qquad (3.7) \\
S_m^{(2)}\eta &= \frac{2i}{g^2}\mathrm{tr}\left[-\bar{\psi}\bar{\sigma}_m(\sigma^{kl}F_{kl}+i[\phi,\phi^\dagger])\eta - i\sqrt{2}D_k\phi^\dagger\eta\sigma^k\bar{\sigma}_m\lambda\right] - 2i\mathrm{tr}\delta_{BRST}(\bar{c}\bar{\psi}\bar{\sigma}_m\eta) \\
&= \frac{2i}{g^2}\mathrm{tr}\delta_\eta^{(2)}(-\bar{\psi}\bar{\sigma}_m\psi+\bar{\lambda}\bar{\sigma}_m\lambda) - 2i\mathrm{tr}\delta_{BRST}(\bar{c}\bar{\psi}\bar{\sigma}_m\eta) \qquad (3.8) \\
J^{(1)} &= -2i\mathrm{tr}\delta_{BRST}(\bar{c}\partial_m\bar{\lambda}\bar{\sigma}^m) \qquad (3.9) \\
J^{(2)} &= -2i\mathrm{tr}\delta_{BRST}(\bar{c}\partial_m\bar{\psi}\bar{\sigma}^m) \qquad (3.10)
\end{aligned}$$

We multiplied supercurrents by a global Grassmann parameter η to form Lorentz scalar quantities.

An interesting property of $N = 2$ superalgebra is the general existence of the central charge, which can appear in $\{Q_\alpha^{(1)}, Q_\beta^{(2)}\}$[1]. To calculate this anti-commutator, we start with the Ward-Takahashi identity for supersymmetry in path integral formulation, which is obtained from the expression $\langle S_m^{(2)}(y)\eta\rangle$ and a change of integration variables corresponding to localized supersymmetry $\delta_\xi^{(1)}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int d^3x\ \xi\Big[\partial_0\langle \mathrm{T}^* S^{0(1)}(x)S_m^{(2)}(y)\eta\rangle - \langle \mathrm{T}^* J^{(1)}(x)S_m^{(2)}(y)\eta\rangle\Big] \\
= \ &-2\sqrt{2}i\delta(x^0-y^0)\Big\langle \xi\eta\ \frac{2}{g^2}\partial^n\mathrm{tr}\Big[(F_{nm}+i\tilde{F}_{nm})\phi^\dagger\Big](y) - \xi\sigma_k\bar{\sigma}_m\eta\ \mathrm{tr}\delta_{BRST}(\bar{c}D^k\phi^\dagger)(y)\Big\rangle \\
&-\frac{\partial}{\partial x^0}\delta(x^0-y^0)\Big\langle \frac{2}{g^2}\mathrm{tr}\Big(\bar{\psi}\bar{\sigma}_m\sigma^{0k}\eta\delta_\xi^{(1)}A_k\Big)(y)\Big\rangle \qquad (3.11)
\end{aligned}$$

where, for notational simplicity, we wrote the Ward-Takahashi identity multiplied by a *global* ξ. We also used the equations of motion

$$D^nF_{nm} = i[D_m\phi^\dagger,\phi] - i[\phi^\dagger, D_m\phi] - [\bar{\lambda},\bar{\sigma}_m\lambda] - [\bar{\psi},\bar{\sigma}_m\psi] \qquad (3.12)$$

$$\sigma_m D^m\lambda = \sqrt{2}[\phi^\dagger,\psi] \qquad (3.13)$$

in the above derivation, which is expected to be a safe operation. The term proportional to $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^0}\delta(x^0-y^0)$ in (3.11) can be dropped if one uses the T-product by the BJL prescription. We then obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big[\xi Q^{(1)}(x^0), \eta S_m^{(2)}(y)\Big]_{x^0=y^0} &= -2\sqrt{2}i\Big(\xi\eta\ \frac{2}{g^2}\partial^n\mathrm{tr}\Big[(F_{nm}+i\tilde{F}_{nm})\phi^\dagger\Big](y) \\
&\quad - \xi\sigma_k\bar{\sigma}_m\eta\ \mathrm{tr}\delta_{BRST}(\bar{c}D^k\phi^\dagger)(y)\Big) \qquad (3.14)
\end{aligned}$$

after rewriting (3.11) in terms of the T-product and operating the time-derivative in the left-hand side explicitly. The electric charge n_e and magnetic charge n_m are given by

$$\int d^3x\ \frac{2}{g^2}\partial_n \mathrm{tr}(F^{n0}\phi^\dagger) = a^*\Big(n_e + \frac{\theta}{2\pi}n_m\Big) \tag{3.15}$$

$$\int d^3x\ \frac{2}{g^2}\partial_n \mathrm{tr}(\tilde{F}^{n0}\phi^\dagger) = -\frac{4\pi}{g^2}a^* n_m \tag{3.16}$$

where a is the asymptotic value of ϕ at spatial infinity. Eq.(3.15) represents the so called "Witten effect" [7]. Note that θ does not appear in the expressions of supercurrents, and it enters in the superalgebra only through (3.15).

The equal-time commutator of supercharges is obtained from (3.14) by integrating over d^3y as

$$\Big[\xi Q^{(1)}(x^0), \eta Q^{(2)}(x^0)\Big] = -2\sqrt{2}i\Big(\xi\eta Z^* - \xi\sigma_k\bar{\sigma}^0\eta\int d^3x\ \mathrm{tr}\delta_{BRST}(\bar{c}D^k\phi^\dagger)(x)\Big) \tag{3.17}$$

where the central charge is given by

$$Z = an_e + \tau a n_m \tag{3.18}$$

$$\tau = \frac{\theta}{2\pi} + i\frac{4\pi}{g^2} \tag{3.19}$$

Eq.(3.17) has a general structure as in (1.4), and Z gives rise to the standard formula of the central charge of $N = 2$ super Yang-Mills theory [2]. We emphasize that our derivation of (3.17)$\sim$ (3.19) is fully quantum mechanical in the framework of path integral, which is based on the Lorentz covariant Landau gauge.

4 $D = 10$ massive superparticle (D-particle)

In this section we analyze the super algebra for a $D = 10$ massive superparticle in the BRST framework. Due to the well-known complications arising from the off-shell non-closure of κ-symmetry, a straightforward prescription does not work. Nevertheless, we can devise a working prescription for this case also. The Lagrangian of a massive superparticle is given by [8]

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = \frac{\Pi_m^2}{2e} - \frac{M^2}{2}e - iM\bar{\theta}\Gamma_{11}\dot{\theta} \tag{4.1}$$

where e is the einbein , M is the mass of the superparticle and we defined

$$\Pi_m = \dot{X}_m - i\bar{\theta}\Gamma_m\dot{\theta} \tag{4.2}$$

The index m runs from 0 to 9, and θ is a 32-component Majorana spinor. Here Γ^m are the 10-dimensional Dirac matrices and Γ_{11} is a counter part of γ_5. We have $\bar{\theta}\eta = \bar{\eta}\theta$ and $\bar{\theta}\Gamma_m\eta = -\bar{\eta}\Gamma_m\theta$ for two Majorana spinors. Instead of (4.1), we here use the first order Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = P_m\Pi_m - \frac{e}{2}(P_m^2 + M^2) - iM\bar{\theta}\Gamma_{11}\dot{\theta} \tag{4.3}$$

where $\not{P} \equiv P_m\Gamma^m$. In the chiral notation, the above Lagrangian is re-written as

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = P_m\dot{X}_m - i\bar{\theta}_L \not{P}\dot{\theta}_L - i\bar{\theta}_R \not{P}\dot{\theta}_R - iM(\bar{\theta}_R\dot{\theta}_L - \bar{\theta}_L\dot{\theta}_R) - \frac{e}{2}(P_m^2 + M^2) \tag{4.4}$$

The action thus defined has a local κ-symmetry

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_\kappa\theta &= (M + \not{P}\Gamma_{11})\kappa, \quad \delta_\kappa P_m = 0 \\
\delta_\kappa X^m &= i\bar{\theta}\Gamma^m\delta_\kappa\theta \\
\delta_\kappa e &= 4i\dot{\bar{\theta}}\Gamma_{11}\kappa
\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

The so-called "irreducible κ-symmetry"[8, 9] is to choose $\kappa = \kappa_R \equiv \frac{1}{2}(1-\Gamma_{11})\kappa$. Under this symmetry, field variables transform as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\theta_R &= M\kappa_R, \quad \delta\theta_L = -\not{P}\kappa_R \\
\delta X^m &= i\bar{\theta}_R\Gamma^m M\kappa_R - i\bar{\theta}_L\Gamma^m \not{P}\kappa_R \\
\delta e &= -4i\dot{\bar{\theta}}_L\kappa_R, \quad \delta P_m = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

We choose the gauge conditions $e = 1$ and $\theta_R = 0$, which are effected by the gauge fixing and Faddeev-Popov terms given by

$$\mathcal{L}_g = B(e-1) + ib(\dot{c}e + c\dot{e}) + \bar{\tilde{\xi}}_L\theta_R \tag{4.7}$$

One may understand (4.7) as formally obtained from

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_g &= \delta_{BRST}\Big[b(e-1) + \bar{\beta}_L\theta_R\Big] \\
&= B(e-1) + ib(\dot{c}e + c\dot{e} - 4i\dot{\bar{\theta}}_L\gamma_R) + \bar{\xi}_L\theta_R - \bar{\beta}_L(ic\dot{\theta}_R - M\gamma_R) \\
&= B(e-1) + ib(\dot{c}e + c\dot{e}) + \bar{\tilde{\xi}}_L\theta_R + \bar{\tilde{\beta}}_L M\gamma_R
\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

where γ_R is the ghost related to the κ-symmetry, and $\bar{\tilde{\beta}}_L \equiv \bar{\beta}_L + 4b\dot{\bar{\theta}}_L$ and $\bar{\tilde{\xi}}_L \equiv \bar{\xi}_L + i\frac{d}{dt}(c\bar{\beta}_L)$ after partial integration. The variables c, b are fermionic reparametrization ghost and anti-ghost, respectively, and $(\bar{\beta}_L, \bar{\xi}_L)$ are the Nakanishi-Lautrup fields to implement $\theta_R = 0$. The parameter ϵ is a Grassmann parameter.

The ghost sector $\bar{\tilde{\beta}}_L M\gamma_R$ in the final expression of (4.8) is analogous to that of the unitary gauge in Higgs mechanism, and it is expected that $\tilde{\beta}_L$ and γ_R do not contribute to the discontinuity in unitarity relations. One may then path integrate out $\tilde{\beta}_L$ and then γ_R , and after the path integration the following (nil-potent) reparametrization BRST symmetry remains in the action defined by (4.7)

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta X^m &= -i\epsilon(c\dot{X}^m), \quad \delta e = -i\epsilon(\dot{c}e + c\dot{e}) \\
\delta\theta_R &= -i\epsilon(c\dot{\theta}_R), \quad \delta\theta_L = -i\epsilon(c\dot{\theta}_L) \\
\delta c &= -i\epsilon c\dot{c}, \quad \delta P_m = -i\epsilon(c\dot{P}_m) \\
\delta b &= \epsilon B, \quad \delta B = 0 \\
\delta\bar{\tilde{\xi}}_L &= -i\epsilon\frac{d}{dt}(c\bar{\tilde{\xi}}_L)
\end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

where the transformation property of $\tilde{\xi}_L$ is regarded to be induced by the original transformation law

$$\delta\bar{\beta}_L = \epsilon\bar{\xi}_L, \quad \delta\bar{\xi}_L = 0 \tag{4.10}$$

What we have achieved in (4.7) is that the irreducible κ-symmetry in (4.6) is effectively gauge fixed without a ghost for κ-symmetry by using the algebraic $\theta_R = 0$ gauge and thus the issue of off-shell non-closure of κ-symmetry is avoided. See also Ref.[10] for a recent Hamiltonian analysis of this problem by using a different form of "reparametrization" symmetry which exists in the superparticle.

The global target space SUSY is defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_{SUSY}\theta_{L,R} &= \epsilon_{L,R} \\
\delta_{SUSY}X^m &= i\bar{\epsilon}_L\Gamma^m\theta_L + i\bar{\epsilon}_R\Gamma^m\theta_R \\
\delta_{SUSY}e &= 0, \quad \delta_{SUSY}P_m = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

The variation of the total action $S = S_0 + S_g$ under SUSY transformation with localized (time dependent) parameters $\epsilon_{L,R}(t)$ is

$$\delta S = \int dt\Big(i\dot{\bar{\epsilon}}_L Q_R + i\dot{\bar{\epsilon}}_R Q_L + \bar{\epsilon}_R\tilde{\xi}_L\Big) \tag{4.12}$$

which defines supercharges

$$Q_R = 2(\not{P}\theta_L - M\theta_R) \tag{4.13}$$

$$Q_L = 2(\not{P}\theta_R + M\theta_L) \tag{4.14}$$

Equations of motion for $Q_{L,R}$(or Ward-Takahashi identities) are obtained by using (4.12) in the path integral

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}Q_R(t) &= 0 \\ \frac{d}{dt}Q_L(t) &= -i\tilde{\xi}_L(t) \end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

The charge Q_L is not conserved due to the term $\bar{\tilde{\xi}}_L\theta_R$ in $\mathcal{L}_g$. However one can find the supercharge which is conserved up to a BRST exact term. For this purpose, we rewrite the equation (4.15). From the equation of motion for θ_R we obtain

$$\frac{\partial S_0}{\partial \theta_R} + \frac{\partial S_g}{\partial \theta_R} = \frac{\partial S_0}{\partial \theta_R} + \bar{\tilde{\xi}}_L = 0 \tag{4.16}$$

where we wrote the total action as a sum of the main part S_0 and the gauge fixing part S_g.

On the other hand , the κ-symmetry of S_0 suggests

$$\int dt \left[\frac{\partial S_0}{\partial \theta_R(t)}M\kappa_R(t) + \frac{\partial S_0}{\partial \theta_L(t)}\delta\theta_L(t) + \frac{\partial S_0}{\partial X^m(t)}\delta X^m(t) + \frac{\partial S_0}{\partial e(t)}\delta e(t)\right] = 0 \tag{4.17}$$

Since X^m and θ_L do not appear in S_g, we have the equations of motion

$$\frac{\partial S_0}{\partial \theta_L(t)} = \frac{\partial S_0}{\partial X^m(t)} = 0 \tag{4.18}$$

The equation of motion for $e(t)$ is

$$\frac{\partial S_0}{\partial e(t)} + \frac{\partial S_g}{\partial e(t)} = 0 \tag{4.19}$$

We thus obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int dt \frac{\partial S_0}{\partial \theta_R(t)}M\kappa_R(t) &= \int dt \frac{\partial S_g}{\partial e(t)}\delta e(t) \\ &= \int dt \Big(B + ib\dot{c} - i\frac{d}{dt}(bc)\Big)(-4i\dot{\bar{\theta}}_L\kappa_R) \end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

If we combine the above equations (4.16) and (4.20), we obtain

$$M\bar{\tilde{\xi}}_L = 4\frac{d}{dt}(bc\dot{\bar{\theta}}_L) + 4i\Big(B\dot{\bar{\theta}}_L + b\frac{d}{dt}(ic\dot{\bar{\theta}}_L)\Big) \tag{4.21}$$

Thus we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}Q_L &= -i\bar{\tilde{\xi}}_L \\ &= -\frac{4i}{M}\frac{d}{dt}(bc\dot{\bar{\theta}}_L) + \frac{4}{M}\delta_{BRST}(b\dot{\bar{\theta}}_L) \end{aligned} \tag{4.22}$$

We may thus define

$$\tilde{Q}_L(t) = Q_L(t) + q_L(t) \equiv Q_L(t) + \frac{4i}{M} b(t)c(t)\dot{\theta}_L(t) \tag{4.23}$$

which satisfies

$$\frac{d}{dt}\tilde{Q}_L = \frac{4}{M}\delta_{BRST}(b\dot{\theta}_L) \tag{4.24}$$

namely, $\tilde{Q}_L$ is conserved up to a *BRST exact term.* A relation of the structure of this last equation is also derived for a supermembrane[11] , for example, by observing that the κ-symmetry transformation does not interfere with the reparametrization symmetry properties[12].

Note that q_L is *not* BRST closed $\delta_{BRST}(q_L) \neq 0$. Therefore q_L cannot be written in a BRST exact form $q_L \neq \delta_{BRST}(*)$. In the context of our general analysis, the gauge fixing fermion Ψ in the present case is regarded to be given by (see (4.8))

$$\Psi \equiv b(e-1) + \bar{\beta}_L \theta_R \tag{4.25}$$

One can then confirm for a localized δ_{SUSY}

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{SUSY}\delta_{BRST}\Psi &= \epsilon\bar{\xi}_L\epsilon_R(t) - i\bar{\beta}_L c\dot{\epsilon}_R(t) \\ &\neq \epsilon\bar{\xi}_L\epsilon_R(t) \\ &= \delta_{BRST}\delta_{SUSY}\Psi \end{aligned} \tag{4.26}$$

Therefore the relation (1.1) does not hold in the present example, namely, $\delta_{BRST}(q_L) \neq 0$. However, one can confirm that

$$\delta'_{SUSY}\delta_{SUSY}\delta_{BRST}\Psi = \delta_{BRST}\delta'_{SUSY}\delta_{SUSY}\Psi = 0 \tag{4.27}$$

(in fact, $\delta'_{SUSY}\delta_{SUSY}\delta_{BRST}(e,\theta_R) = \delta_{BRST}\delta'_{SUSY}\delta_{SUSY}(e,\theta_R) = 0$) and thus the property (1.4) is expected to hold. This is confirmed by the following explicit calculation.

It is important to observe that the extra term $q_L(t)$ in $\tilde{Q}_L(t)$ contains the derivative of θ_L variable. This means that the localized supersymmetry transformation of $q_L(t)$ gives rise to a term proportional to $\partial_t\delta(t-t')$, which is eliminated by BJL prescription. Consequently, it does not influence the equal-time SUSY algebra (i.e., Q_L and $\tilde{Q}_L$ satisfy the same form of algebra). Therefore,we analyse the anti-commutator of $Q_{L,R}$ in the rest of this section.

If we make the change of variables generated by a *localized* SUSY transformation (4.11) in the path integral defined by, for example,

$$\langle Q_{R\beta}(s)\rangle \equiv \frac{1}{Z}\int d\mu Q_{R\beta}(s)e^{iS} \tag{4.28}$$

where $Z = \int d\mu e^{iS}$, we obtain the following relations (Ward-Takahashi identities),

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\Big\langle \mathrm{T}^* Q_R^\alpha(t) Q_{R\beta}(s)\Big\rangle &= \Big\langle 2\,\not{P}^\alpha{}_\beta \delta(t-s)\Big\rangle \\
\frac{d}{dt}\Big\langle \mathrm{T}^* Q_L^\alpha(t) Q_{L\beta}(s)\Big\rangle &= \Big\langle 2\,\not{P}^\alpha{}_\beta \delta(t-s) - \mathrm{T}^* i\tilde{\xi}_L^\alpha(t) Q_{L\beta}(s)\Big\rangle \\
\frac{d}{dt}\Big\langle \mathrm{T}^* Q_L^\alpha(t) Q_{R\beta}(s)\Big\rangle &= \Big\langle 2M\delta^\alpha{}_\beta \delta(t-s) - \mathrm{T}^* i\tilde{\xi}_L^\alpha(t) Q_{R\beta}(s)\Big\rangle \\
\frac{d}{dt}\Big\langle \mathrm{T}^* Q_R^\alpha(t) Q_{R\beta}(s)\Big\rangle &= \Big\langle -2M\delta^\alpha{}_\beta \delta(t-s)\Big\rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{4.29}$$

All the operator ordering is defined by T*-product in path integral. We have no terms which contain $\partial_t\delta(t-s)$, and we obtain the T-product relations by using the BJL prescription

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\Big\langle \mathrm{T} Q_R^\alpha(t) Q_{R\beta}(s)\Big\rangle &= \Big\langle 2\,\not{P}^\alpha{}_\beta \delta(t-s)\Big\rangle \\
\frac{d}{dt}\Big\langle \mathrm{T} Q_L^\alpha(t) Q_{L\beta}(s)\Big\rangle &= \Big\langle 2\,\not{P}^\alpha{}_\beta \delta(t-s) - \mathrm{T} i\tilde{\xi}_L^\alpha(t) Q_{L\beta}(s)\Big\rangle \\
\frac{d}{dt}\Big\langle \mathrm{T} Q_L^\alpha(t) Q_{R\beta}(s)\Big\rangle &= \Big\langle 2M\delta^\alpha{}_\beta \delta(t-s) - \mathrm{T} i\tilde{\xi}_L^\alpha(t) Q_{R\beta}(s)\Big\rangle \\
\frac{d}{dt}\Big\langle \mathrm{T} Q_R^\alpha(t) Q_{R\beta}(s)\Big\rangle &= \Big\langle -2M\delta^\alpha{}_\beta \delta(t-s)\Big\rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{4.30}$$

If one uses the Lagrangian (4.1) instead of (4.3), the T*-product gives rise to identities with extra terms proportional to $\partial_t\delta(t-s)$.

When one explicitly operates the time derivative in the left-hand sides of (4.30), one obtains equal-time anti-commutator by using the equations of motion in (4.15). Comparing the both sides of (4.30), one thus obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
\{Q_R^\alpha(t), Q_{R\beta}(t)\} &= 2\,\not{P}^\alpha{}_\beta \\
\{Q_L^\alpha(t), Q_{L\beta}(t)\} &= 2\,\not{P}^\alpha{}_\beta \\
\{Q_L^\alpha(t), Q_{R\beta}(t)\} &= 2M\delta^\alpha{}_\beta \\
\{Q_R^\alpha(t), Q_{L\beta}(t)\} &= -2M\delta^\alpha{}_\beta
\end{aligned} \tag{4.31}$$

where M can be thought of as a "central charge". These relations reproduce the expected form (written in a chiral notation) of superalgebra

$$[\bar{\epsilon}Q, \bar{\epsilon}'Q] = 2\bar{\epsilon}(\not{P} + M\Gamma_{11})\epsilon' \tag{4.32}$$

Note that we do not obtain the BRST exact pieces in the right-hand sides of (4.31) due to (4.27).

One can confirm that all the correlation functions in (4.29) are well-defined . The essence of our path integral is described by the Lagrangian

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}} \equiv P_m \dot{X}^m - i\bar{\theta}_L \not{P}\dot{\theta}_L - i\bar{\theta}_R \not{P}\dot{\theta}_R - iM(\bar{\theta}_R\dot{\theta}_L - \bar{\theta}_L\dot{\theta}_R) - \frac{1}{2}(P_m^2 + M^2) + \bar{\tilde{\xi}}_L\theta_R \tag{4.33}$$

after path integration over other unphysical variables. The path integral is then defined by , for example,

$$\langle \mathrm{T}^* Q_R(t)Q_R(s)\rangle = \int \mathcal{D}P_m\mathcal{D}X^m\mathcal{D}\theta_L\mathcal{D}\theta_R\mathcal{D}\tilde{\xi}_L Q_R(t)Q_R(s)e^{i\int\tilde{\mathcal{L}}dt}/\int d\mu e^{i\int\tilde{\mathcal{L}}dt} \tag{4.34}$$

The extra factor arising from the second-class constraint[10], which may be represented by introducing an extra *bosonic* spinor ϕ_L described by $\mathcal{L}' = -i\bar{\phi}_L\not{P}\phi_L$, does not influence our correlation functions. It is significant that the Hamiltonian is given by $H = \frac{1}{2}(P_m^2 + M^2) - \bar{\tilde{\xi}}_L\theta_R$ in (4.33), and the quantum fluctuation of $\bar{\tilde{\xi}}_L\theta_R$ term generally smears the pole position of the Hamiltonian $H = \frac{1}{2}(P_m^2 + M^2)$. We can thus avoid the appearance of singular correlation functions in (4.29). The advantage of the present path integral approach is that we can directly obtain the physical results without going through the Dirac bracket manipulation.

We emphasize that our treatment of κ-symmetry also works for a supermembrane[11][12], for example.

5 Discussion

We have illustrated the simple rules in (1.1) - (1.4) for a general class of supersymmetric gauge theories when quantized by the BRST procedure. In our formulation, the Faddeev-Popov ghosts and Nakanishi-Lautrup fields are all assigned to be SUSY scalar. In practical applications, our method directly gives rise to desired results without going through the (often complicated) Dirac bracket analysis. Our treatment of these algebraic relations are in the full quantum mechanical level up to possible quantum anomalies.

It is possible to incorporate the conventional gauge invariant (but not necessarily supersymmetric) regularization into our scheme. We can thus readily derive the anomalous commutator such as (in the one-loop level accuracy)

$$[\xi Q, R^0(x)] = -\xi S^0(x) + i\frac{Ng^2}{4\pi^2}\mathrm{tr}(\bar{\lambda}\bar{\sigma}^{lm}F_{lm}\bar{\sigma}^0\xi) \tag{5.1}$$

for the supercharge Q_α and the chiral R - symmetry current $R^m(x) = 2\mathrm{tr}(\bar{\lambda}\bar{\sigma}^m\lambda)$ for the Lagrangian (2.1), by using the conventional chiral anomaly for $\partial_m R^m(x)$ and the BJL prescription. However, it is not easy to make a global supersymmetric structure manifest in our component formulation in the Wess- Zumino gauge. As a result, we have not succeeded so far in identifying the possible central extension of $N = 1$ SUSY algebra suggested in Ref.[13] in a reliable way; the suggested possible central extension is related to quantum anomaly and written as an integral of total (spatial) divergence. What we need is a generalization of the path integral evaluation in Ref.[14] and a supersymmetric generalization of the analyses in Ref.[15], for example.

With this limitation in mind, we still believe that our simple rules in (1.1) - (1.4) should be useful in the practical analyses of SUSY algebra and its physical implications.

References

[1] For a review of supersymmetry,
J. Wess and J. Bagger, *Supersymmetry and Supergravity* (Princeton Univ. Press, 1983).

[2] E. Witten and D. Olive, Phys. Lett. **B78** (1978) 97.

[3] K. Johnson and F. E. Low, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **37-38** (1966) 74.
J. D. Bjorken, Phys. Rev. **148** (1966) 1467.

[4] B. de Wit and D. Z. Freedman, Phys. Rev. **D12** (1975) 2286.

[5] J. W. van Holten, Phys. Lett. **B200** (1988) 507.

[6] S. Ferrara and B. Zumino, Nucl. Phys. **B79** (1974) 413;
A. Salam and J. Strathdee, Phys. Lett. **B51** (1974) 353;
R. Grimm, M. Sohnius and J. Wess, Nucl. Phys. **B133** (1978) 275.

[7] E. Witten, Phys. Lett. **B86** (1979) 283.

[8] M. Aganagic, C. Popescu and J. H. Schwarz, Phys. Lett. **B393** (1997) 311; Nucl. Phys. **B495** (1997) 99.

[9] E. Bergshoeff, R. Kallosh, T. Ortin and G. Papadopoulos, hep-th/9705040.

[10] R. Kallosh, hep-th/9705056.

[11] E. Bergshoeff, E. Sezgin and P. K. Townsend, Ann. of Phys. **185** (1988) 330 and references therein.

[12] K. Fujikawa and K. Okuyama, hep-th/9709044, to appear in Nucl. Phys. B.

[13] G. Dvali and M. Shifman, Phys.Lett. **B396** (1997) 64.
A. Kovner, M. Shifman and A. Smilga, hep-th/9706089.
B. Chibisov and M. Shifman, hep-th/9706141.

[14] K. Konishi and K. Shizuya, Nuovo Cimento **90**(1985)111.

[15] K. Fujikawa, Phys. Lett. **B188** (1987) 115; Phys. Lett. **B171** (1986) 424.